

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 23 and 26 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 23 and 26 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 1, lines 14-21, and page 12, line 26 - page 13, line 17. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Pesin in the February 6 personal interview and February 12 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1, 23 and 26 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interviews. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. The Claims Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that the specification does not define ASP data, and it is not clear from the specification what exactly ASP data is. This assertion is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, ASP data is data addressed to the application service provider. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 23 and 26 are amended to clarify that ASP data corresponds to application service provider (ASP) data, the ASP data requiring execution of an application program to generate image data. The specification supports this feature at least at page 12, line 26 - page 13, line 4. For example, the specification discloses that a first CPU 200 determines if a transfer command from the network interface controller 220 is a command addressed to ASP terminal portion 20 or a

command addressed to a projector portion 30 (specification, page 12, lines 26-31). If the command is directed to the ASP terminal portion 20, the first CPU 200 loads a viewer application suitable for the data and generates user interface data from the data, which is then transferred to graphics controller 210 together with a draw command (the specification, page 13, lines 5-11). In other words, the CPU 200 determines whether the data is addressed to ASP terminal portion, i.e., ASP data, or a command addressed to a projector portion 30, i.e., image data. Thus, the specification describes the claimed subject matter in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skill in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

Therefore, for at least these reasons and those argued during the personal interview, claims 1, 23 and 26, and claims 3-22, which variously depend from independent claims 1, 23 and 26, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 22-25

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2002-023148 to Yasukawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502 to Araujo et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yasukawa and Araujo, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 3-8, 10-12 and 22-25. For example, as agreed during the personal interview, neither of applied references teaches or suggests "the network connection portion determining whether the received data is image data or application service (ASP) data, the ASP data requiring execution of an application program to generate the image data, ... an internal image data generating portion for generating user interface image data for display, ... by executing an application program for the ASP data when the network connection

portion determines that the received data is the ASP data, the projector having a single body ..." as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added). Similarly, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests "the transmitting/receiving device determining whether the received data is image data or application service provider (ASP) data, the ASP data requiring execution of an application program to generate the image data; an internal image data generating device to generate the ASP user interface image data for display on the basis of the received data by executing an application program for the ASP data when transmitting/receiving device determines that the received data is the ASP data, the projector having a single body ..." as recited in independent claim 23 (emphasis added). In other words, as agreed during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests projector that a single body that is capable of functioning as an ASP client that needs to choose between simply projecting the received data (image data), or activating a program for ASP data to project the target image, when receiving the data, as in the claimed invention.

As acknowledged by the Office Action, Yasukawa does not teach or suggest a network connection portion that determines whether the received data is ASP data or an internal image data generating portion that generates image data by executing application program for the ASP data as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. Furthermore, Araujo does not remedy the deficiencies of Yasukawa.

Araujo merely discloses an ASP technique that uses a personal computer as an ASP client. The methods and apparatus of Araujo merely allow a user to access typical office network-based applications, including e-mail, file sharing and hosted thin-client programs through a remotely located network, e.g., when connected to a browser (Araujo, Abstract). In other words, in the ASP technique disclosed by Araujo, a user can access the office network-based applications by clicking on icons that are displayed via a web server (Araujo, col. 14, lines 45-66). Araujo thus requires user input to access the hosted thin-client programs. However, in

the claimed invention, the projector determines whether the received data is image data or application service provider (ASP) data and executes an application program for the ASP data if it is determined that the received data is the ASP data.

Further, Araujo is incapable of projecting received image data and does not disclose the required configuration for projecting received image data because it merely discloses a personal computer as an ASP client. Thus, Araujo does not teach or suggest a network connection portion that determines whether the received data is image data or application service provider (ASP) data nor an internal image data generating portion that generates image data by executing application program for the ASP data as recited in the independent claims.

Moreover, there is no motivation combine the teachings of Araujo with the projector of Yasukawa as alleged by the Office Action. As discussed above, Araujo merely discloses a personal computer as an ASP client that is incapable of projecting image data. Furthermore, Araujo merely discloses a system that allows a remotely stationed user to access typical office network-based applications, including e-mail, file sharing and host thin-client programs through a remotely located network, e.g., when connected to a browser. That is, Araujo does not teach or suggest using a projector as an ASP client nor the constituent features that are necessary when a projector is used as an ASP client. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Araujo, i.e., remote access to typical office network-based applications, with the projector of Yasukawa to achieve the claimed invention.

Because no motivation exists in either Yasukawa or Araujo to be combined or modified as alleged by the Office Action, the asserted combination is improper and appears to be based on impermissible hindsight.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and those agreed to during the personal interview, independent claims 1 and 23 are patentable over Yasukawa and Araujo. Further,

claims 2-8, 10-12, 24 and 25, which variously depend from claims 1 and 23, are also patentable over Yasukawa and Araujo, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 23, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 9

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa in view of Araujo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yasukawa and Araujo, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach the features of claim 9. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Thus, claim 9 is patentable over Yasukawa and Araujo, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 13 and 14

The Office Action rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa in view of Araujo and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,814 to Usami et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yasukawa, Araujo and Usami, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 13 and 14. Usami does not remedy the deficiencies of Yasukawa and Araujo discussed with respect to claim 1. Usami is cited by the Office Action only for its alleged teaching of appending date/time information to image data. Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 1. Thus, claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Yasukawa, Araujo and Usami for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

D. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 15-20

The Office Action rejects claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa in view of Araujo and Usami, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,239 to Berstis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yasukawa, Araujo, Usami and Berstis, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 15-20. Berstis does not remedy the deficiencies of Yasukawa, Araujo and Usami discussed with respect claim 1. Berstis is cited by the Office Action only for its alleged teaching of a configuration that handles HTML data. Claims 15-20 depend from independent claim 1. Thus, claims 15-20 are patentable over Yasukawa, Araujo, Usami and Berstis for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

E. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 26 and 27

The Office Action rejects claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,055,534 to Hylin et al. in view of Yasukawa and further in view of Araujo. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed to during the personal interview, Hylin, Yasukawa and Araujo, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 26 and 27. For example, none of the applied references teaches or suggests a method for displaying images that includes "determining whether the received user interface data is user interface image data or application service provider (ASP) data, the ASP data requiring execution of an application program to generate the image data; generating, in the projector, user interface image data for display on the basis of the received user interface data by executing an application program for the ASP data when the received user interface data is the ASP data,

the projector having a single body in which to perform ...," as recited in independent claim 26 (emphasis added).

As acknowledged by the Office Action, neither Hylin nor Yasukawa teaches or suggests determining whether the received data is ASP data or generating image data by executing application program for the ASP data as recited in independent claim 26. Further, Araujo does not remedy the deficiencies of Hylin and Yasukawa.

As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 23, Araujo merely discloses an ASP technique that uses a personal computer as an ASP client. The methods and apparatus of Araujo merely allow a user to access typical office network-based applications, including e-mail, file sharing and host thin-client programs through a remotely located network, e.g., when connected to a browser (Araujo, Abstract). In other words, in the ASP technique disclosed by Araujo, a user can access the office network-based applications by clicking on icons that are displayed via a web server (Araujo, col. 14, lines 45-66). Araujo thus requires user input to access the hosted thin-client programs. However, in the claimed invention, the projector determines whether the received data is image data or application service provider (ASP) data and executes an application program for the ASP data it is determined that the received data is the ASP data.

Further, Araujo is incapable of projecting received image data and does not disclose the required configuration for projecting received image data because it merely discloses a personal computer as an ASP client. Thus, Araujo does not teach or suggest determining whether the received data is image data or application service provider (ASP) data nor generating image data by executing application program for the ASP data as recited in the independent claims.

Moreover, there is no motivation combine the teachings of Araujo with the projectors of Hylin and Yasukawa as alleged by the Office Action. As discussed above, Araujo merely discloses a personal computer as an ASP client that is incapable of projecting image data.

Furthermore, Araujo merely discloses a system that allows a remotely stationed user to access typical office network-based applications, including e-mail, file sharing and host thin-client programs through a remotely located network, e.g., when connected to a browser. That is, Araujo provides does not teach or suggest using a projector as an ASP client nor the constituent features that are necessary when a projector is used as an ASP client. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the alleged teachings of Araujo, i.e., remote access to typical office network-based applications, with the projectors of Hylin and Yasukawa to achieve the claimed invention.

Because no motivation exists in either Hylin, Yasukawa nor Araujo to be combined or modified as alleged by the Office Action, the asserted combination is improper and appears to be based on impermissible hindsight.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and those agreed to during the personal interview, independent claim 26 is patentable over Hylin, Yasukawa and Araujo. Further, claim 27, which depends from claim 26, is also patentable over Hylin, Yasukawa and Araujo, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 26, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: February 15, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
